

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	F	TLING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
09/305,234	05/04/1999		GEORGE V. GUYAN	10022/248	1833
28164	7590	11/03/2004		EXAMINER	
		CAGO 28164	RIMELL, SAMUEL G		
BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE P O BOX 10395			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
CHICAGO, IL 60610			2165		

DATE MAILED: 11/03/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)					
Office Action Summers	09/305,234	GUYAN ET AL.					
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit					
	Sam Rimell	2165					
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address					
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be time within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	ely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. O (35 U.S.C. § 133).					
Status							
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on	_•						
2a) This action is FINAL . 2b) ∑ This	action is non-final.						
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is							
closed in accordance with the practice under E	x parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 45	3 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims							
4)⊠ Claim(s) 1-21 and 32-37 is/are pending in the a	application.						
•	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.							
6) Claim(s) 1-21 and 32-37 is/are rejected.							
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.							
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	election requirement.						
Application Papers							
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner	·						
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acce		Examiner.					
Applicant may not request that any objection to the o							
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction	on is required if the drawing(s) is obj	ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).					
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Exa	aminer. Note the attached Office	Action or form PTO-152.					
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119							
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priori application from the International Bureau 	have been received. have been received in Application ity documents have been receive (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No d in this National Stage					
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of	of the certified copies not receive	d. Semons					
		SAM RIMELL PRIMARY EXAMINED					
Attachment(s)	_						
1) X Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4) Interview Summary (Paper No(s)/Mail Da	·					
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date		atent Application (PTO-152)					

Application/Control Number: 09/305,234

Art Unit: 2165

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

<u>Claim 7:</u> The phrase "to task assistant" is unclear and appears as though it may be missing words.

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-21 and 32-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Borghesi et al. (U.S. Patent 5,950,169).

Claim 1: Borghesi (FIG. 2) a computer system that is controlled by a computer programming for handling tasks related to auto insurance claims (col. 4, lines 19-35).

The data component of the programming is the programming which controls the communications server (36), which is capable of sending or retrieving data amongst different offices.

The client component of the programming is demonstrated by the user interface screens of FIGS. 6-15. These user interface screens permit the processing of auto insurance claims.

Application/Control Number: 09/305,234

Art Unit: 2165

Within the client component exists an adapter component in the form of a mailbox system (86-92) which allow a user to transmit and receive work files. FIGS. 6-15 pertain to one such work file.

Within the client component are business components, which are the data entry boxes shown in each of FIGS. 6-15.

A controller component is illustrated by FIG. 14. The controller acts as a log to both generate records of events and record events generated by the user. Completed logs are then sent back to the file repository, which is the storage system (col. 8, lines 10-13).

As seen in FIG. 14, the portion of the client component in FIG. 14, the log allows a user to define tasks (for example "accepted bid") and rules (for example, "events sorted by date/time") while the program that operates the interface is running. The tasks are those carried out by an employee. The tasks may be selected based on predetermined events, such as the predetermined events shown in box 352. Within FIG. 14, predetermined events are received and specifically selected by a user, at which point they are placed in an event log. The event log may then be output to the outbox and stored in a data repository.

Claim 2: The event log in FIG. 14 indicates completed tasks. For example, the task of "First Customer contact" was completed on 10/10/95.

<u>Claim 3:</u> The pre-determined events are listed in an event queue (352). They can be selected by a user and received into the event log.

Claim 4: The event queue (352) is populated with events. These events are from the data component by reason that they reside in files that can be transmitted from or to the data component.

Claim 5: The event queue is populated with events (352). The events are from the client component by reason that they are accessible in a user interface (FIG. 14) which is part of the collection of interfaces that make up the client component.

Claim 6: The goals of the programming are insurance related (col. 4, lines 19-35 and col. 15, lines 34-37).

Claim 7: The report generating function (object 5 in FIG. 14 is readable as a task assistant.

Claim 8: See remarks for claim 1. The dirty flag processing is further taught by Borghesi. By applicant's definition in the specification, dirty flag processing refers to flags that are set to true when a user changes some of the entered data. One example of this is shown in FIG. 24, blocks 551-552. If data has been changed to indicate that parts are available, the decision is flagged as being true (yes), and the processing continues from the true (yes) decision. Another example exists at step (258), which is a trigger readable as a flag that is activated when the data has changed.

<u>Claim 9:</u> See remarks for claim 2.

<u>Claim 10:</u> See remarks for claim 3.

Claim 11: See remarks for claim 4.

Claim 12: See remarks for claim 5.

<u>Claim 13:</u> See remarks for claim 6.

Claim 14: See remarks for claim 7.

Claim 15: See remarks for claim 1.

Claim 16: See remarks for claim 2.

Art Unit: 2165

Claim 17: See remarks fro claim 3.

Claim 18: See remarks for claim 4.

<u>Claim 19:</u> See remarks for claim 5.

Claim 20: See remarks for claim 6.

Claim 21: See remarks for claim 7.

Claim 32: The data component (server 36 in FIG. 2) communicates with a data repository (26 in FIG. 2) that stores all the data from the workfiles. Alternatively, the data repository (26 in FIG. 2) can itself be viewed as the data component.

Claim 33: The pre-determined events are listed in the box (352) of FIG. 14. These are types of completed tasks.

Claim 34: See remarks for claim 32.

Claim 35: See remarks for claim 33.

Claim 36: See remarks fro claim 32.

Claim 37: See remarks for claim 33.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Sam Rimell at telephone number (571) 272-4084.

Sam Rimell Primary Examiner Art Unit 2165